

## Tilburg University

The report 'Accomplishing Europe Through Education and Training' considered from the point of view of Catholic education

Jonkers, P.H.A.I.

*Published in:*  
European Journal for Education Law and Policy

*Publication date:*  
2000

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Jonkers, P. H. A. I. (2000). The report 'Accomplishing Europe Through Education and Training' considered from the point of view of Catholic education. *European Journal for Education Law and Policy*, 4, 69-75.

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## The report of *Accomplishing Europe through Education and Training* considered from the point of view of Catholic education

Peter Jonkers

*Professor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Utrecht, the Netherlands, and President of the Dutch Catholic School-Council*

### 1. Introduction

The aim of this contribution is to look for possibilities, in dialogue with the Report, for Catholic education to make an effective contribution to European integration. This investigation consists of three sections. Firstly I shall give an analysis of what the Report has to say on upbringing and education, people, society and the construction of European citizenship. I shall then point out several fundamental tensions that are implicitly present in the Report in connection with these points. And finally I shall attempt to clarify how Catholic education, with its objective of training the whole of mankind and starting from a Christian inspiration, can cope with these tensions. This approach means I shall not be dealing with the valuable ideas mentioned in the Report on all manner of specific questions, such as the organisation of vocational education, the way in which education must take advantage of the new information technology, increasing efficiency and effectiveness, improving the position of teachers, etc.. I shall leave such questions to education experts and policy-makers. The crux of this paper is an analysis of the general pedagogical orientation and the objectives of the Report with a view to shaping opinions in this respect from the side of Catholic education. From the outset, I want to place this contribution within the framework of an open dialogue with the Commission of the European Union. This implies two things. Firstly, it means that Catholic education must recognise that the tensions analysed below, as they emerge from the Report, can be felt in all schools, including Catholic ones. Put positively, these tensions mean just as many challenges for education as such (and therefore also for Catholic education) and up to a point for European society as a whole. For (Catholic) education is no island in European society, but to a considerable extent a reflection of it. A second implication of the commitment to an open dialogue is that Catholic education has just as few made-to-measure answers to the challenges indicated as the Report. From its own philosophical inspiration, Catholic education will search for answers to the great questions of our time. Based on this it will perhaps place different accents than those proposed in the Report. But in any case it is important to appreciate that the Report gives an insight into a sincere search for possibilities to prepare young people for the future society in a European context. This idea of a common effort and responsibility for the future of young people can thereby

form the framework of a necessary dialogue between the European Commission and Catholic education.

### 2. Analysis of the report

#### *Objective of education*

According to the Report, the European education strategy must take account of three important requirements: (i) the need to strengthen European competitiveness in economic, technological and organisational areas, (ii) the need to help solve a number of social problems (multiculturalism, the loss of social reference points, individualism, ethnic and religious fundamentalism, poverty, social marginalisation and exclusion), and (iii) the need to respect the fundamental principles of upbringing, which extend far beyond the utilitarian. Following on from this, education has three objectives: first and foremost the development of the whole person, then socialisation, i.e. the general accessibility of education for as many people as possible, and finally personal and vocational preparation for entry into a complex, demanding and rapidly changing world.

This list reveals that despite the heavily economic and technological approach to education in the Report as a whole, the importance of education is central to the incarnation of man. Man is more than his life as a consumer, producer or trader; human aspects such as ethics, culture, commitment to and care for others must (re-)assume their rightful place in education. The other objectives of education, namely strengthening European competitiveness and preserving employment, just like education as preparation for the information society, must be subordinated to this. Against this background, education must first and foremost affirm and pass on to young people those common values which are of essential importance to their incarnation. These values include: human rights and human dignity, fundamental freedoms, democratic legitimacy, peace and the of rejection of force, respect for others, a spirit of solidarity, equivalent development, equal opportunities, rational thinking, the preservation of the ecosystem and personal responsibility.

### *Human vision*

If we then examine how the incarnation of man is interpreted in the Report, we see that in the tracks of the Enlightenment it is equated with personal, autonomous choice and opposed with authority. Plato's idea that upbringing must be based around the idea of good and must be for the benefit of developing a fair society is dismissed as a form of authoritarianism. After all, in Plato, good is not something about which each individual decides himself on the basis of personal choices, but the fruit of a metaphysical doctrine in which the philosopher determines good and imposes it on others from his position of power. According to the Report, the same use of metaphysical models to impose private (church) interests in an authoritarian manner is characteristic of the education organised by the Church in the Middle Ages and the Reformation. In spite of this, during this period valuable values and virtues were promoted which became part of the European legacy, such as, for example, the incomparable dignity of man and the importance of education for his social and spiritual development. But the value of the Enlightenment is that it freed these ideas from their traditional authoritarian framework and placed the unprejudiced scientific mind and rational knowledge in the foreground. As a result of this development the following were seen as conditions for human development: rational reason, the methodological ability to approach knowledge and an artistic and cultural curiosity. This entire development was aimed at the self-realisation of man, together with the nullification of all stereotypes of what human existence is. Human rights ultimately function as the most important reference point in terms of content for what man is, together with social, egalitarian, intercultural and ecological citizenship.

### *Social vision*

The relationship between individual and society has different layers, which means that the individual is linked to the society in which he lives in different ways: citizenship is a social practice (the conditions and procedures based on which young people gain access to fully fledged citizenship), a normative idea (people belong to a political community because they adopt certain standards and values) and a relational practice (active citizenship requires a cognitive and communicative capacity). A specific social problem in this connection is how the most important objective of education, the development of the whole person, can be achieved within the context of seeking to increase the quality of human resources in the business world. Another important problem in this connection is social cohesion. Here is an important task for the government which is responsible for maintaining social justice. Against this background, it is of prime importance that education is financially accessible to all and offers equal chances for all. This means among other things making extra efforts for those marginalised by society.

### *Vision of Europe*

European thinking was originally based on economic goals. But gradually people felt the need to develop a social and human identity, based on the prosperity and diversity of European culture. This is the European vision which forms the basis of the project of the "construction" of European citizenship. European citizenship is an essentially humanistic idea developed to construct a democratic Europe with respect for a balance between economic, technological, ecological and cultural considerations. The European vision implies that our nations learn to live together and regulate their differences without looking for foreign scapegoats. This European vision translates in concrete terms into (i) the construction of European citizenship through education and training, (ii) the strengthening of European competitiveness and the preservation of employment through education and training, (iii) the maintenance of social cohesion through education and training, (iv) education and training in the information society. In addition to the result of a construction by the peoples on a peaceful and democratic basis, however, Europe is also a common inheritance, which begins in classical antiquity and runs through the Christian Middle Ages, the Renaissance and Humanism, the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, the arrival of the modern natural society, the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, the social upheavals of the nineteenth century, etc. to our era. The result of this development is a plurality of philosophies of life and values that provide guidance for European citizens, but which nevertheless are held together at the same time by the feeling of belonging to a common culture. The task of education is to pass these values, which are the inalienable legacy of European culture, on to subsequent generations.

### **3. Tensions in the report**

On the basis of this first analysis of the Report, I would now like to try and trace a number of fundamental tensions that are implicitly present in the text. I shall bring these tensions together around the aforementioned central points. We are then dealing with the tension between the intrinsic and the instrumental value of education, between man who creates himself and his values autonomously and the same man who is ultimately seeking a successful self-realisation recognised by our culture, between a competitive individual and the need for social cohesion, between Europe as construction and Europe as tradition. It is interesting that at the beginning of the last chapter, the Report refers to a number of these tensions and presents them as fundamental dilemmas of education, but also of society as a whole. We are then dealing with the tension between economic and technological competitiveness and the need for social cohesion, the possibility of making room for technological progress in our culture, the tension between subjectivity of interpersonal relations and the objectivity of business relations. When analysing these tensions I am not concerned with criticising the Report. Rather, I see the expression of these tensions as an element in a growing consciousness-raising process which in our time

seems be faced with a certain modern vision of man and society on its borders. Therefore we must not see these tensions as threats, but rather as challenges for the education of the future. For the future of Europe it is of prime importance to respond to these. Naturally these response will vary, as they are dependent on the different educational traditions and systems in the various countries of the European Union. Catholic education is only one form of education. But the concern for the future of education is a joint responsibility for all those involved in it. This shared responsibility is the most important basis for a dialogue between the authors of the Report and Catholic education.

#### *Tension between intrinsic and utilitarian values of education*

Despite the view that the development of the whole person is the most important objective of education, it nevertheless remains to be seen whether the Report actually succeeds in maintaining the importance of this intrinsic value of education. The emphasis lies heavily on the moulding of intellectual capacities and the associated skills, while the dimensions of the affective and the behavioural hardly get a look in. The moulding of the whole man threatens to be reduced to his upper half! Furthermore, from chapter 3 of the Report the utilitarian (in particular, the economic and technological) aspect of education becomes so dominant that tension unavoidably is created with the intrinsic value of education. This is evident from the fact that the quality of education is interpreted as a derivative of the idea of quality in the business world. The latter is characterised by a manufacture/consumer relationship where the latter takes priority, a dominant influence of the demands of the labour market on the direction of education, schooling which prepares for excessive forms of "job rotation" and which through the teaching of intercultural skills readies pupils for an international working environment. The problem created by this, namely the pressure which the economic and technological system places on education as such, is noted, but not thematised as such. The instrumental and intrinsic values of education are therefore at loggerheads here.

#### *Tension in the vision of man*

I would like to concentrate this point on the obvious tension in the Report between autonomy and heteronomy. On the one hand it is maintained that education must nullify all stereotypical perceptions of people, in particular where these are based on all forms of authoritarian decision. In the tracks of the Enlightenment it is maintained that man is autonomous, i.e. must make himself on the basis of personal choices. But on the other hand, directly after this and without a great deal of argumentation the Report introduces a number of other stereotypes (social, egalitarian, intercultural and ecological citizenship). More generally, the Report regularly refers to a set of (common) values and standards, or to a common set of rules and principles of behaviour, without these necessarily implying that the same values are shared. In this way, European citizenship becomes a normat-

ive idea, based on a non-negotiable foundation, democratic human rights. However, in the Report this normative idea is laid down just like that as the objective of education. By what right does the government take it upon itself to lay down this objective? In any case, whether such a school of thought completely trips up the idea of autonomy. More generally, insufficient consideration of the fundamental tension between autonomy and heteronomy is taking its revenge here. Despite the repeated emphasis on personal autonomy, according to the Report, values and standards are also ultimately not merely a question of personal choice. They also form part of the inalienable European legacy, of the common culture to which European citizens belong. In this sense they are given, and are discovered by the individual and occasionally personally appropriated. Moral obligations with given values are clearly unavoidable, and they point to what is intrinsically valuable. These values ultimately determine whether the self-realisation of man is a *successful* self-realisation. Because the Report takes insufficient account of this fact, it threatens to see tradition merely as a collection of outmoded opinions. The way in which conservative and progressive are systematically opposed and given a value judgement in the Report is a clear example of this.

Another aspect of the tension between autonomy and heteronomy concerns the relationship between the government which sets itself up as an autonomous agent and the parents of the pupils. Nowhere in the Report is there a reference to the parents, despite their being initially responsible for the upbringing of their children, and therefore also for the direction of this upbringing. The question is whether in this connection the government has the right to impose via standards the idea of European citizenship and the specific interpretation which it gives to this concept.

#### *Tension between individual and community*

An individualistic human vision predominates in the Report, as can be seen from the third and fourth chapters. The need for Europe to remain competitive within the global market is immediately translated into a selective and competitive education system. People must be mobile, and more generally be prepared to live in a rapidly moving and unpredictable world. This option unavoidably leads to a concentration of (educational) effort on the most dynamic individuals and to a compensation of the losers, provided the budget permits it. But the Report also considers an alternative option, (educational) quality for all: this option requires the mobilisation of all financial, political and human resources. This option is mainly discussed in the fourth chapter of the Report, which is devoted to maintaining social cohesion through education. It is noticeable here that this chapter is seen entirely in the light of as broad an access as possible to the various forms of education, an equal opportunities policy and the stimulation of socially underdeveloped groups to participate in education. These responsibilities are subsequently passed on in their entirety to the state and the other public authorities.

The question is whether in this way the Report solves the evident tension between the individual and the communal, not to mention the problems for social cohesion which it cre-

ates. Economic and technological competitiveness, which is aimed at the individual, is very dominant in the Report and is at loggerheads with the need for social cohesion. The Report appears unable to find a suitable balance between these. It concentrates rather one-sidedly on the intellectual élite and takes little account of the fact that for the majority of Europeans, a large number of the recommendations (mobility over the whole of Europe, the learning of two languages in addition to the mother tongue, etc.) are not practical propositions. But on top of this, social cohesion implies much more than the aforementioned government measures, however important they are intrinsically. The view that education itself can and must make an important contribution to stimulating social cohesion, is never expressed in this chapter. If the theme is dealt with at all, it is in the second chapter, within the framework of the "citizen upbringing" section or as values which (together with others) provide guidance for the education process as a whole. But the Report nonetheless pays very little attention to this important question.

#### *Tension between a Euro-functionalistic and a Euro-traditional approach*

The objective of upbringing and education must be more Euro-specific. But does this then mean mainly the Europe of the single market or of a common tradition, such as, for example, European humanism? Both approaches feature in the Report. On the one hand, one wants to build on a common European legacy, so much even that the three most important objectives of education are seen as a fruit of this tradition. Even the most important values which must be passed on in education (respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy, peaceful resolution of conflict, respect for others, solidarity, equality, etc.) are seen as a fruit of this tradition. But on the other hand the Report also displays a functionalistic approach to Europe: the Report sets itself the goal of "constructing" a European citizenship through "social engineering" which forms a balance between economic, technological, ecological and cultural factors.

This functionalistic approach is at its clearest when the Report declares itself to be an advocate of getting this European citizenship accepted via appropriate didactic methods and with new elements in the educational curriculum. These and many other passages with the same import show that the European dream which is behind the Report is that of achievable society, and achievable culture. The fundamental problem here is expressed well by T.S. ELIOT: "Practical plans for world organisation lie within the field of technical, organisational questions, questions of machinery. Machinery is necessary and valuable. But a culture develops not organisationally, but organically. Culture grows; one cannot build a tree". A functionalistic Europe is not identical to a cultural Europe; the second cannot be planned and constructed. There is no available tradition. The functional and the traditional are both necessary, but the one cannot replace the other.

#### **4. The contribution of Catholic education to European integration**

What contribution can Catholic education make towards European integration? And how does this contribution tie in with the project of European citizenship as expressed in the European Commission's Report? Is there a common basis for a dialogue between the two? First and foremost it is important to emphasise that the basis for this dialogue lies in the fundamental agreement between the Report and Catholic education with regard to the most important objective of education: for both the most important goal of education is the development and moulding of the whole person. This moulding is in the service of the incarnation of man and society. It is clear that these days this objective is under pressure from all manner of tendencies to instrumentalise. The areas of tension analysed above express this pressure well. In this sense they are the expression of the problems and challenges with which education is faced nowadays. In all sorts of concrete translations schools get to see this almost daily, regardless of whether they are public or Catholic schools. Are schools still in a position to pay attention to the generally formative activities in a situation in which the requirements of the education curriculum and the labour market are becoming ever more stringent? What sort of values can schools still pass on to a society in which narrow subjectivism is so dominant? Can schools still be islands of social cohesion in a society which is individualising ever further? Is it not evidence of a narrowly functionalistic approach if each social problem (for example, that of the construction of Europe) is translated into a (new) task for schools, and then is again translated into a concrete, functional series of lessons? Do all these forms of extremely functionalistic "social engineering" really serve the goal of education? On this point the situation of Catholic education is the same as that of state-controlled education.

This common initial situation and the common main objectives of education make it possible to open a dialogue with the authors of the Report on the responses which can be given to the said questions. The challenge for Catholic education consists of drawing its responses from the religious inspiration which is its most important source in order to contribute thus to the humanisation of European society. Specific to Catholic education is that it wishes to achieve this general objective of education, the moulding of the whole person, from its own religious tradition, in which human existence is central as a gift and task of God. But, "the proof of the pudding is in the eating". In other words: the value of Catholic education will be seen from the contribution it can make to resolving the tensions analysed above. On this point a dialogue with the Report is necessary and useful.

*The most important challenge facing Catholic education is preserving the intrinsic value of education against the pressure of all manner of forms of instrumentalisation. The UNESCO Report on education is more successful than the Report of the European Commission in expressing this goal in concrete terms, and in this way highlighting the moulding*

of the whole person. It speaks of the four pillars of education: **learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together and learning to be**. In my opinion, the individual character of each education must consist of expressly paying attention to all four of these pillars. Specific to Catholic education is that this attention takes its shape from the belief in the intrinsic dignity of man as the child of God. Learning to know means that a balance is sought between a sufficiently broad general education and the possibility of exploring a limited number of disciplines in greater detail. In this way one avoids each professional group asserting its own claims on the content of education, as is the case in the Report up to a point. Learning to act does not merely involve learning a vocational skill, but also the acquisition of a skill to be able to cope with all sorts of different situations on a personal and social level. Learning to live together indicates that education has an important part to play in stimulating mutual respect and responsibility between individuals, between natives and foreigners, between different religions and outlooks on life, between different socio-economic groups, between the intellectual and cultural élite and the masses, etc.. Finally, learning to be refers to the sphere of creativity and imagination, of art and culture. But for Catholic education it also refers to the need for a philosophical and religious dialogue with all pupils. On this point, Catholic education has a long tradition. For Catholic education, "learning to be" also refers to the sphere of the transcendental, which places man against a broader horizon and involves him on the basis of existence. This Christian-inspired vision of the foundations of moulding and education can represent a response to the challenges of education today, as these are referred to as dilemmas in the Report. As a consequence of the domination of the instrumental value of education in our society, we are barely still able to answer the question of whether we are capable of making room in our culture for technological progress and the question of a responsible balance between the subjectivity of interpersonal relations on the one hand and the objectivity of business relations and the soulless nature of cyberspace on the other. The major problem of instrumental rationality in our culture is that it is not placed within a broader horizon of man as a whole and his intrinsic dignity. As a result, this lost rationality continually conjures up its counterpart, namely the experience of radical futility and nihilism.

*A second challenge concerns the vision of man*, concentrated on the relationship between autonomy and heteronomy. Again the problem arises here of modern culture, which is not capable of looking at man against a broader background. As a result, autonomous man sees himself as the measure of all things. From a Catholic perspective it is important to establish that in contrast to this widespread preconception the autonomy of man is always relative. He is not his own creator, and consequently no more the creator of his culture or the ideals and values passed on in this culture, among other things by education. A one-sided emphasis on autonomy leads to a spiritual poverty which is characteristic of large groups of young people nowadays. This is a major

challenge for Catholic education. It must stimulate young people to climb out of their own limited world by bringing them into contact with a cultural inheritance and with God as the Creator of man. Only in this way will they succeed in finding a more genuine autonomy. What it boils down to is that young people are again challenged by ideals and by people who propagate these ideals.

This problem also plays a major role at the heart of the educational relationship itself. With regard to the content of the education curriculum and the teaching offered, it is always a question within education of a teacher-pupil relationship, based on trust, authority and dialogue. It is down to teachers to pass on to the pupil that which mankind has learnt about itself and about nature, everything essential that it has created and discovered. Well now, young people of today are at the same time less hemmed in than previously by family structures and religious movements, but also better informed, especially as to their individual rights. The consequence of this is that the aforementioned authority relationship is under pressure because of the one-sided emphasis on individual autonomy amongst pupils. Furthermore, society is inclined to expect teachers to steer clear of or counteract the negative consequences of this restricted autonomy. A teaching climate that is becoming more difficult therefore goes hand in hand with higher teaching requirements and expectations. It therefore comes as no surprise that in this situation, many teachers feel overloaded and unjustly criticised. The UNESCO Report speaks in this connection of the need to respect the dignity of teachers.

*A third challenge concerns the relationship between individual and society*. In the Report this question is presented as the balance between economic and technological competitiveness and the need for social cohesion. The Report argues in this connection for easy access to education and equal opportunities for all pupils to guarantee social cohesion. But however important this argument is, it is not sufficient for social cohesion. For this reason it is also necessary that education sees it as one of its pedagogical tasks to teach pupils to live together (cf. above under the objectives of education). For Catholic education this means that one must move away from the view that man only fully achieves his humanity in a community. Competitiveness and selectivity must not therefore be the most important characteristics of education, but must be countered by a concern for solidarity with others.

According to the UNESCO Report, education must walk two complementary paths to achieve social cohesion: the gradual discovery of others and the commitment to common projects. The goal of education is to simultaneously educate the diversity of the human race and the awareness of the similarities and the mutual dependence of all people on the earth. Knowing yourself and knowing others must go hand in hand. Thus, for example, one can teach young people to take on the views of other ethnic or religious groups in a process of religious and philosophical communication. In this way one can try to avoid mutual incomprehension. But even the study of the European tradition in general does not have the sole aim of giving pupils an "*esprit de finesse*", but also of

making them open to listening to other cultures. Another way to achieve social cohesion is collaboration on projects: all sorts of social activities, both aimed at school itself and at a wider society, are important examples here. In this way a sense of common responsibility and consideration for the vulnerability of every man can grow. These two paths do not really involve new areas in the school curriculum, but a social inspiration from which education is provided.

*A final challenge for Catholic education is finding a balance between a functionalistic approach to Europe and a European project for the future based on passing on the European legacy. As demonstrated above, the Report too easily assumes the feasibility of (European) society. In that connection elements from the cultural legacy that are of use to the "construction" of Europe are retained and other aspects of the tradition pushed to one side. Such an approach to Europe is evidence of a narrow ideological preoccupation and is therefore doomed to failure. The cultural construction of Europe cannot be planned. The cultural legacy is not the property of any government body or church organisation, they can never possess it. It boils down to passing on the European tradition in its rich diversity to subsequent generations. It is up to them to determine how they will interpret the past and integrate it into the project of their culture. Naturally, certain choices will be unavoidable in the offer to pupils. Seen in concrete terms, they will depend on the philosophical orientation of the various schools. Proceeding from this approach to Europe as a cultural tradition, it is the specific task of Catholic education to pass on the Christian legacy to subsequent generations. As cultural and religious actualities, religions still belong to the cultural, social and educational reality of our time. On this basis, they must be passed on to future generations just as much as the humanistic values and ideals of the Enlightenment. Furthermore, the Christian tradition offers important sources of inspiration for implementing a European cultural project.*

## **5. Conclusion: the Catholic school and the goal of Europe**

The responses to the challenges outlined above will be decisive for the future of education in general and therefore also for Catholic education. What values does education want to pass on to pupils with a view to moulding the person as a whole? The essential pedagogical values involved here concern the incarnation of man, the importance of ideals which go beyond the individual I, the dignity of teachers, the discovery of and respect for others and the irreplaceable significance of tradition. This brings us to the key question, which in fact forms the basis of my contribution: to what extent can the school be a place for transferring and communicating values and what does this imply in concrete terms? This question applies to both state-organised education and Catholic education. Peculiar to the latter is that it tries to answer this question from its religious tradition, human existence as a gift and task of God. Because the con-

viction of Catholic education is that values are not freely available commodities, but only acquire their significance from a coherent vision of man and world. Conversely, this vision of man and world has repercussions on all dimensions of the educational process.

To clarify this question I will return first to the Report. Although the question of the school as a place for the transfer and communication of values only explicitly comes up when it involves the value of European citizenship, this problem crops up repeatedly in the Report. It shows considerable hesitation with regard to this question. Through education common values are given form and are passed on to the next generation. This is even a decisive factor for the success of European integration. Europe is united by the feeling of belonging to a common culture. But at the same time Europe no longer has an undisputed and clear social or human model that can serve as a goal for education. What Europe does have is a diversity which provides the necessary ethical points of reference for education. In this context it comes down to determining what values we wish to pass on to our children. This tension between cultural diversity and cohesion leads to the claim that *"we must appear to be in a position to accept a common set of rules and principles for behaviour without necessarily sharing the same values"*. This results in a shared political culture of democracy which clears the way to a post-national model of Europe to which all European citizens belong, regardless of whether they subscribe to common values or of their specific origin. From these quotations it appears that the Report has a typically liberal opinion of Europe as a (value) community. Determining the content of these values is to a great extent left to the autonomous freedom of the individuals, so that they are privatised. The government restricts itself to drafting the rules of the game (procedural values) and laying down one or two very general principles, such as democratic human rights. In this context, cultural diversity is reduced to different practical interpretations of the same principles.

Without being able to examine here the most important theoretical problems associated with the relationship between procedural and content-related values, the question arises here of whether such a model for education (but ultimately also for Europe) can in fact persist. Because in spite of all good intentions there is a risk of values becoming individual lifestyles, from which people can choose at their discretion. In addition to individualisation, a certain neutralisation also unavoidably occurs: against the background of the great procedural principles of the liberal society, content-related values seem to be of scarcely any importance. They are reduced to local peculiarities with at best a folkloric significance. The important liberal value of tolerance towards every man's sacred convictions thus degenerates to an indifference with regard to private peculiarities. Thirdly, democratic human rights, however important they may be, do not provide a project for living together. They are primarily individual rights of freedom which are aimed at protecting the private life of the individual from the influence of the state. But this says nothing about the positive values which form the core of human society. As a consequence of all these



factors young people finish up in a state of permanent uncertainty over what makes living worthwhile. In this context of individualisation and neutralisation of values a problem arises which according to many observers represents the key question of European integration: arisen from the need to work together on an economic level and organised according to the principles of liberal society, Europe is missing a goal and a heart which form the social and political core of its social project.

In what way can Europe be given a heart and a goal, and what role can education play in this? In my opinion, this question must be central in deliberations as to the role of education for the benefit of European integration. The shortcomings of a liberal, procedural interpretation of values outlined above point in the direction of the need for concrete communities which find each other around specific positive, substantial values. Only in this way can Europe acquire a heart and a goal. In this perspective Catholic education wants to contribute in its own way. Naturally Catholic schools do not have a monopoly on the transfer and communication of values. From other religious and philosophical traditions (Protestant-Christian, Islamic, Jewish, Socialist, Humanist, anthroposophical, etc.), other types of education will give a different content and direction to the aforementioned substantial values. This means that the goal and the heart of Europe is no monolithic entity, but a dynamic whole of different (substantial) value orientations and contents which work mutually with each other on the European agora.

What does this vision of the need to give Europe a heart and a goal through paying attention to substantial values mean for Catholic schools? It is clear that most Catholic schools can today be typified as multicultural societies in miniature, in which pupils from different backgrounds in ethnic, cultural and religious terms sit next to each other. I think that in this situation there is little point in searching for a highest common factor in the area of actual existing values in Catholic schools. It is to be expected that the result of such an operation will reach no further than the acceptance of democratic human rights, just as in the Report quoted above. The way in which Catholic schools can contribute to the important task of giving Europe a heart and a goal seems to me to lie much more in paying attention to the transfer and communication of values in the pedagogical project of the school, in other words in the way in which teaching to live, trade, live together is given both its contents and form. This attention is inspired by the conviction that the moulding of the whole person (the most important objective of education) must also imply a spiritual education. The school must try to

find a middle path between excessive attention to standards and values on the one hand and the misconception which exists in thinking that these values are a sort of obvious (natural) fact.

An excessive teaching of the "correct" values would make the school into a sort of "Sunday school". However legitimate it is to try and convince someone of the correctness of their values, such a method is not a good pedagogical approach for (Catholic) schools. After all, the aim of bringing children up by values is not to bind a person to the convictions of the upbringer, but to make them aware of what it means to live their life by good. On the other hand, however, the absence of attention to values would lead to pupils not being offered a counterweight to the values of the market and the issues of the day, and to the procedural values of a liberal society not being given any content.

In Catholic education this process of the transfer and communication of values gets its orientation from the great values of the Christian faith, both because of its intrinsic and historical-cultural significance. As noted above, this then involves, for example, the intrinsic dignity of man as opposed to all forms of instrumentalisation, the sense that the autonomy of man is only relative, the view that man only finds his true vocation in a community and respect for the great cultural and religious traditions. But at the same time it is clear that in the current pluriform context of the school, these values cannot make any claim to exclusivity. This is why a dialogal transfer and communication of values must form the core of the pedagogical project of Catholic education. By stimulating such a culture of the transfer and communication of values in relation to their philosophical context, Catholic education can help give Europe a heart and a goal.

## References

- Accomplishing Europe through Education and Training*. European Commission, 1997.
- Learning. The Treasure Within*. Report to UNESCO, 1996.
- Eliot, T.S. *Die Einheit der europäischen Kultur*. Berlin, 1946.
- Van Luyn, Mgr. A. *Europe from a Community of Valuta to a Community of Values*. Brussels, 1997.
- Ladentin, V. *Europa und erziehender Unterricht. Grundfragen in sich verändernder Zeit*.
- Rekus, J. *Knowledge and Values. Teaching Curriculum Content with a Focus on Moral Education*.
- Verhack, I. *Appel en faveur du souvenir de l'héritage moral et spirituel de l'Europe*.
- Witte, H. *De vitale katholieke school van de toekomst*.